

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claim 7 is cancelled.

Claims 1-6 are rejected.

No amendments are being submitted with this response.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-6 in view of the following arguments.

**Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

**Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-6**

The Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot (US PG PUB 2006/0156362 A1) (hereinafter Perrot) in view of Silagi et al. (US PG PUB 2004/0122864 A1) (hereinafter Silagi) and Nandikonda et al. (US PAT 6,314,111 B1) (hereinafter Nandikonda). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

With regard to claim 1, the Office Action rejects this claim for reasons of obviousness in view of a combination of the three documents cited above. The Applicants respectfully disagree that the invention as claimed in claim 1 would have been obvious for the person skilled in the art at the time of the invention based on a combination of the cited documents. The invention concerns discovery of DVB services offered on an IP network by a terminal connected to the IP network, the discovery information, being related to the delivery on the IP network being comprised in NIT and SDT tables that are comprised in Transport Streams (TS). All cited documents teach away from the claimed invention.

Perrot lacks, among others, teaching of any use of NIT and SDT for comprising discovery information for DVB services transmitted over an IP network as is admitted in the Office Action.

The Examiner is of the opinion that Silagi teaches [0031-0033] extraction of a NIT from a transport stream, and that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to extract from the stream at least the NIT. When Silagi discusses extraction of a NIT from a transport stream, Silagi handles [0031-0033] prior art arrangement of MPEG-2 transport stream packets. Prior art mentions indeed such extraction. But Silagi is silent about extraction of a NIT from a transport stream when it is transmitted over an IP network. This is as expected, because the prior-art NIT does not contain descriptors that are valid for the transmission of the stream over the IP network. Rather, the prior-art NIT is used when transmitting over a non-IP network, such as a satellite delivery network, as is also mentioned by Silagi [0033]: *‘For example, in a satellite broadcast network, NIT 26 would contain information regarding orbital position, the polarization, carrier frequency and other information relating to the satellite’*. The prior-art NIT, comprising such information is not useful for service discovery when transmitting a transport stream over an IP network. Silagi thus teaches away from the present invention, clearly mentioning that the NIT is used for satellite reception. The present invention however uses, notwithstanding the teaching of prior art, the NIT for service discovery when the transport stream is transmitted over an IP network. The applicants submit that the person of ordinary skill in the art would thus not have considered Silagi that is silent about the use of the NIT for service discovery in an IP delivery environment, and teaches instead that the NIT is to be used in case of satellite reception.

For the person of ordinary skill in the art, the prior art teaching of Silagi that the NIT is not to be used for discovery of services offered on an IP network is further confirmed by Nandikonda. Nandikonda discusses a NIT at col. 9 line 32-40 and col. 11 line 29-35. In particular col. 11 line 33-35 *‘the network information table gives the physical parameters of the data transmission channel’*. At col. 12 lines 30 – col 13 table 3, Nandikonda gives different examples of these physical parameters, which are all related to delivery on non-IP type networks. Table 2 gives an example of parameters for a cable television network. Table 3 gives an example for delivery via a satellite channel. Nowhere, neither Silagi nor Nandikonda, which both discuss the use of NITs,

disclose that the NIT has a use for discovery of services offered on an IP network. In particular, none of the cited documents disclose that a NIT designates IP addresses that lead to associated SDTs, as is required by the claims. The person of ordinary skill in the art, having read Silagi and Nandikonda, would have been discouraged to use a NIT in an IP distribution environment, both documents teaching that the NIT is only useful in a satellite or cable distribution environment.

If, for the sake of argument, one would combine the teachings of the three cited documents, one would still not arrive at the invention that solves the problem of discovery of services on an IP network. Silagi and Nandikonda teach that the NIT contains parameters related to satellite or cable delivery. Acquiring such a NIT in an environment where services are distributed over IP would thus lead to acquisition of parameters that are of no use in the IP distribution environment. Among others, the information contained in the NIT according to Silagi and Nandikonda would not make it possible to acquire addresses of distribution of transport streams that contain SDT.

For at least the above reasons, the applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Perrot in view of Silagi and Nandikonda.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on patentable claim 1 and add further distinguishing features to that claim. For at least this reason, the applicant submits that Claims 4 and 5 is thus also in condition for allowance.

Apparatus claim 6 comprises similar limitations as allowable method claim 1 in terms of means and the Applicants submit that claim 6 is therefore also in condition for allowance.

### **Rejection of Claim 2**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot, Silagi and Nandikonda in further view of US 2004/0187161 to Cao. The Applicants

respectfully submit that claim 2 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends on allowable claim 1 and adds further distinguishing features to that claim.

**Rejection of Claim 3**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrot and Silagi and Nandikonda as applied to claims 1 and 4-7, and further in view of Van Willigen. The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends on allowable claim 1 and adds further distinguishing features to that claim.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,  
R. Schaefer et al.

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/  
Joel M. Fogelson  
Reg. No. 43,613

Tel. No. (818) 480-5318